



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,802	06/20/2005	Martin Sohn	272999US0PCT	6799
22850	7590	07/16/2010		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
BROOKS, CLINTON A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1621				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/16/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>		Application No. 10/539,802 Examiner CLINTON BROOKS	Applicant(s) SOHN ET AL. Art Unit 1621
--	--	---	---

All Participants:

(1) CLINTON BROOKS.

(2) Daniel Sullivan.

Date of Interview: 8 July 2010

Type of Interview:

☐ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Status of Application: _____

(3) Richard Chinn.

(4) Dr. Molnar.

Time: 2:00 pm

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejections of record

Claims discussed:

Claims 1-20.

Prior art documents discussed:

WO/99/54289 and US-6576788 (the rejection of record)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Daniel M Sullivan/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1621

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In the interview, Examiner discussed his position regarding the limitation "the pressure in each stage being lower than the previous stage". According to the Examiner, the pressure drop is an inherent property since the claims as recited read on natural pressure drop. Further, the Examiner pointed to evidence of this inherent property in the instant specification. Further, the Examiner discussed his position on the three stages. Since the claims do not prove a structural or temporal limitation regarding the residence apparatus, a broad reading of the claims includes the interpretation of any timeframe no matter how small. Thus, a portion of a column could be the residence apparatus. Further, the Examiner pointed out that the combination of residence times (for example claim 5) and separate stages where the pressure is regulated between the residence apparatus and the at least one reaction column (for example claim 9) would limit the claims such that the current interpretation would not apply.